

**REMARKS**

This is a continuation of application Serial No. 09/304,565.

Claims 1, 18 and 19 are pending and claims 2-17 have been canceled. New claims 20-81 have been added.

Claims 18 and 19 were rejected in part on Lemelson in the parent application. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner noted that the Lemelson data entry structure is not on the top of the housing, as claimed, but instead is on the bottom. (Pending claim 19, for example, recites "means on top of the housing for entering data.") The Examiner asserts that the claims are still obvious because the data entry keys perform the same function. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. The test for obviousness is not whether two structures have the same function, but whether the structures as recited would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The Examiner concedes that the recited structure is not found in the cited references, so claims 18-19 should be patentable without more. Additionally, there is no suggestion of placing any data entry structure as claimed. In Lemelson, for example, the data entry structures are inside a housing that protects the inside components, including the internal data entry structure, so the only suggestion in Lemelson is to place the data entry inside rather than outside. The Examiner has not established obviousness of claims 18 and 19.

Claim 20 derives from original claim 8 and claims 21-43 derive from original claims 2-6, 9-17 and from claims 20-29 from the parent application.

New claim 44 derives from claim 31 in the parent application, and should be allowable.

New claims 45-48 are added, wherein claim 45 includes the recitations of claim 11 objected-to in the parent application. The new claims dependent from claim 45 are derived from claims originally dependent from claim 1. These claims should be allowable.

New claims 49-65 are added, wherein claim 49 includes the recitations of claim 16, objected-to in the parent application. The claims dependent from claim 49 are derived from claims originally dependent from claim 1. These claims should be allowable.


New claims 66-81 are added, wherein claim 66 includes the recitations of claim 23, objected-to in the parent application. The claims dependent from claim 66

are derived from claims originally dependent from claim 1. These claims should be allowable.

Consideration of the application and claims in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks is respectfully requested. Early notice of allowance thereof is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees that may be due or credit any overpayments to our deposit Account No. 08-2025. A duplicate copy of this document is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Henricks  
Registration No. 31,168

Dated: July 24, 2003

**HENRICKS, SLAVIN & HOLMES LLP**  
840 Apollo Street, Suite 200  
El Segundo, CA 90245-4737  
310-563-1456  
310-563-1460 (fax)  
[jhenricks@hsh-iplaw.com](mailto:jhenricks@hsh-iplaw.com) (Email)